



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47600 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7600 • 360-407-6000

September 10, 2025

Tom Graham
Director EHS, North America
JELD-WEN, Inc.
2645 Silver Crescent Drive
Charlotte, NC 28273 USA

Re: Jeld Wen – Ecology Comments on Marine EDR

Site Name:	Jeld Wen
Site Address:	300 W Marine View Drive, Everett, WA 98201-1030
Cleanup Site ID:	4402
Facility Site ID:	2757
Agreed Order No.	DE 5095

Dear Tom Graham:

Ecology received your draft Marine Engineering Design Report, dated June 2025, on June 23, 2025. We provided one initial comment, regarding armoring, in a letter dated June 30, 2025. Additional comments followed by email on July 3, 2025. Ecology met with the Tulalip Tribe on July 23, 2025, and the Tulalip Tribe provided comments in a letter dated August 22, 2025. This letter provides additional feedback from Ecology, based on the comments from the Tulalip Tribe.

Ecology requests that Jeld Wen provide responses to both Ecology's and the Tulalip Tribe's comments, to be included with the revised Marine EDR. Attached are the Comments from the Tulalip Tribe, and Ecology's responses. A few of the comments from the Tribe are similar to comments previously provided by Ecology. Note that our responses include some additional requests to Jeld Wen for such previously submitted comments.

Comments related to requests for habitat improvement from the Tulalip Tribe are anticipated to require further discussions. Ecology is requesting a meeting(s) with Jeld Wen, Ecology, the Tulalip Tribe, and other regulatory stakeholders to discuss these comments (note also that the Tulalip Tribe suggested such a meeting). It appears that these habitat-related comments could result in added design elements that would not likely change the existing design elements presented within the EDR. Hence, Ecology has concluded that any conceptual design changes to the EDR to enhance habitat can be incorporated into the 60% design submittal and do not need to hold up finalization of the EDR. Our approval of the final Marine EDR will be following receipt of the revised document that satisfactorily address comments and will be based on a mutual understanding that the 60% design submittal must include any required habitat enhancement components.

Tom Graham
September 10, 2025
Page 2

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,



Frank P. Winslow, LHG
Toxics Cleanup Program
Headquarters Section

cc: Todd Gray, Tulalip Tribe
Nathan Soccorsy, Anchor QEA
Jason Cornetta, Anchor QEA
Josh Morman, Ecology
Susannah Edwards, Ecology
Ryan Hardwick, Ecology
Ecology Site File

Enclosure

Ecology Responses to Comments from the Tulalip Tribes on Draft Marine Engineering Design Report, June 2025 version

Tulalip Tribes Comment #1

Installation of new shoreline armoring requires an HPA and mitigation for impacts from the armoring. The determination that the failed road and asphalt falling into the tidelands was an armored shoreline is questionable. We would like to see a more natural beach without exposed riprap or spall. We suggest covering the capping material with substrate natural to the site and Puget Sound shorelines. Layers of progressively smaller material has proven to work in many scenarios with a final layer of beach fish mix.

There are multiple benefits to a more environmentally appropriate shoreline type, and we believe some mitigation for the new shoreline armoring at the site is warranted. We suggest Ecology reach out to the WDFW Regional Habitat Biologist to discuss armoring mitigation requirements at this site. We are available to join in any discussion with WDFW and Ecology on this matter. At a minimum, we want to see any quarry spall covered with a layer of river or round rock which is more natural to the shorelines of the Puget Sound. We may also suggest some level of shoreline enhancement, which would likely include beach/intertidal plantings, and large wood. We anticipate being given the opportunity to discuss such specifics at the 60% design phase.

Ecology Response:

This comment has not been addressed by Ecology's previous comments. Ecology also would like to see design features that enhance fish habitat, particularly in the logway. The logway is designated as "Aquatic Conservancy" under the City of Everett's Shoreline Master Program. This designation is meant to protect high value natural resources, with a particular focus on salmon habitat. The logway scored highly for salmonid use in the 2001 Snohomish Estuary Wetland Integration Plan Salmon Overlay used to identify Aquatic Conservancy areas (City of Everett Shoreline Master Program, 2019). It is important that habitat is preserved and impacts from shoreline hardening are minimized, whenever possible.

*The energy in the logway is lower and smaller rock is more likely to remain through tidal forces and storms. **Ecology requests that discussions regarding habitat-related comments be held between Jeld Wen, Ecology, the Tulalip Tribe, and pertinent regulatory stakeholders. Any habitat-related design change/additions must be incorporated within the 60% design submittal.***

Tulalip Tribes Comment # 2

We disagree with the statement in the Draft Marine EDR Section 2.1.5 Biological Survey. It is stated on page 7 paragraph 2 that: “There are no federally listed endangered fish species identified in the project area.” The majority of juvenile salmon migrating out of the Snohomish River exit out of the Main Stem Channel. There is a serious deficit in natural estuary off-channel habitat in the lower mainstem / Port Gardner area. The logway channel is not too dissimilar from a blind tidal channel exhibiting reduced water velocities, where juvenile fish seek refuge during salmon outmigration, February – June. It is highly likely this area is utilized by out-migrating juvenile salmon, including ESA listed chinook salmon during this time. These juvenile salmonids also tend to migrate downstream along the edges of the river where there are reduced water velocities and fewer predators, and they would likely end up in the logway when it is inundated.

No evidence is provided to demonstrate the lack of ESA listed salmon presence in this area, per our fish sampling results. The Tulalip Tribes have been conducting fish monitoring efforts across the estuary and Possession Sound for over two decades, and find the above statement claiming no federally listed endangered fish species in the project area, to be factually incorrect. We would like it removed from the Marine EDR.

If Ecology would like, we can provide you with the various reports and journal publications we have produced as evidence that our qualification and knowledge on this topic exceed anything the contractors have provided. In the future we recommend the contractor not use this statement unless they have truly vetted the existing information, or conducted extensive multi-year sampling to justify this statement at the location they are reporting on.

Ecology Response:

*This comment has not yet been addressed in Ecology’s comments. Per the Tulalip Tribes’ monitoring observations described in the above comment, and the ‘Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan’, ESA listed fish species **are** present in the project area (Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, 2005).*

Ecology requests revision of this section to reflect data collected by the Tulalip Tribes and other reliable sources.

Tulalip Tribes Comment # 3

Any capping or armoring at the site needs to be designed so as not to compromise the current restoration efforts along the Mulsby mudflats. There is currently a pilot project effort for the beneficial use of dredge material to place material along the riprapped waterfront area along the mudflats. Any cleanup work should avoid causing complications to this effort. We are open to a meeting with the PLPs, their representatives, or contractors,

to provide information about this effort and discuss how/if any clean up and capping operations will affect it.

Ecology Response:

Please work with the Tulalip Tribes and Port of Everett to maximize compatibility/minimize conflicts of cleanup plans with anticipated future site uses. Ecology requests that Jeld Wen discuss this comment within the EDR including how a later regional beneficial reuse of dredged sediments project could affect or be affected by the Jeld Wen marine cleanup work.

Tulalip Tribes Comment #4

You will need to contact our Cultural Resources staff personnel to review the potential impacts to cultural resources at the site. The site is located in the area of a large former village site. Simply providing information about the depth at which undisturbed soil was found, and stating that work will not take place at or below that depth is likely not sufficient to alleviate concerns about impacts to the Tribes' cultural resources. This is of particular concern for areas in the intertidal area where excavation of contaminated sediment will occur. Please contact Richard Young, Tulalip Tribes Cultural Resource Manager, 360.716.2652, ryoung@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov.

Ecology Response:

The EDR mentions that the Tulalip Tribe was consulted with in cultural resources planning. The tribe does not feel this concern has been fully met and Ecology agrees that the cultural resource manager needs to be made aware of and agree to the plan in the EDR before we are completely satisfied that cultural resources have been appropriately reviewed.

Ecology has forwarded the PRDI Archaeological Monitoring Report to the Tulalip Tribe's Cultural Resources contact. In addition, Ecology Toxic Cleanup Program's (TCP's) Archaeologist will be reviewing cleanup plans prior to cleanup and may issue Cultural Resources compliance requirements. At this time, Ecology is not providing any comments on the Cultural Resources-related elements of the EDR but notes that revision may be required within the 60% or later design submittals.

Tulalip Tribes Comment #5

If any Osprey nests are expected to be lost in association with proposed piling removal activities, an equal number of new nesting piles must be installed in a timely manner. Installation of osprey nesting pilings has been implemented across the Snohomish Estuary

and Tulalip Reservation when creosote piling work has been conducted. We would like to maintain a no net loss of nesting sites for the osprey in the area.

Ecology Response:

*This is something that other agencies are also concerned about and is also being discussed with US FWS and WDFW. **Ecology understands that no Osprey nests are to be removed during the proposed cleanup work, but some nests may be sufficiently proximal such that potential impacts from noise during cleanup work should be considered. Ecology understands that pertinent regulatory agencies will provide requirements on this subject during permitting processes.***

Tulalip Tribes Comment #6

More assessment may be warranted for the following potential issues:

- i) Carefully determine if 3/8" rock is adequate to prevent suspended solids migration on mudflat areas. Consider adding geofabric as necessary to ensure protection from contaminants.
- ii) Carefully assess the potential for lateral migration of contaminants from under uplands, or from under capped areas.

Ecology Response:

*Comment #6i mirrors a similar comment Ecology provided within our July 3, 2025 comments. **Ecology requests the following analysis to assist in addressing this comment:***

*If no geofabric is to be used, a quantitative analysis should be performed, consistent with the methodology used to size a water well filter pack. This analysis includes taking grains size analysis data for native soils, and comparing them with the proposed base/filter media size (e.g. 3/8 inch rock). The results of the analysis should include the calculated percent passing and percent retained materials. **Based on the dioxin/furans concern in shallow soils, Ecology must approve the sizing of base layer to ensure sufficient containment of such soils.***

With respect to the question of lateral migration from contaminants from under uplands or from under capped areas (Comment #6ii) Ecology requests an analysis of the soil-to-groundwater-to-surface water pathway for the contamination that is to remain at the Site following completion of cleanup work. This analysis can be provided as a standalone brief technical memorandum that should provide discussion and evidence on why this pathway will not result in

recontamination of the marine environment following the sediments cleanup work. The analysis should include contaminant fate and transport analyses and discussion for site contaminants, and groundwater data that supports this assertion.